Cultural Factors in the Selection of Marriage Mates
Author(s): August B. Hollingshead
Source: *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 15, No. 5 (Oct., 1950), pp. 619-627
Published by: American Sociological Association
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2086915
Accessed: 10/02/2015 09:44

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

American Sociological Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Sociological Review*.

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 128.235.251.160 on Tue, 10 Feb 2015 09:44:47 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

There is no wish here to present informal union-management relations as a type of behavior unique in our society. We all know the dynamic and experimental nature of our institutional life, especially in the areas of political and sexual behavior. There is probably much similar conduct in our theoretically rigid and impersonal bureaucracies. Ralph Turner has indicated the need of personal, rule-evasive behavior to survive in at least one area of a military bureaucracy[25] (which, unlike industrial bureaucracies, has the power of life and death to enforce its rules).

The extreme positions, that destructive union-management conflict is unavoidable or that perfect cooperation is possible, may need modification. In practice, the sharing of a common human nature stimulates members of both union and management to work under an appearance of conformity and cooperation while manipulating top-level contractual expectations to ease multiple pressures and win personal aims.

This condition[26] is likely to continue as long as (1) workers (a) hope to rise socio-economically, (b) crave personal distinctions, (c) elect ambitious union officers on the strength of their political skills, and (d) aspire to enter the ranks of management; and as long as (2) union and managerial officers find that evasion is of more aid than adherence to rules in protecting themselves against the resentments, aggressions, and expectations of others as all persons involved behave expediently in a social order holding personal success as a major value.

[25] Ralph H. Turner, "The Navy Disbursing Officer as a Bureaucrat," *American Sociological Review,* XI (October, 1946), 501-505.

[26] It is possible that behavior in these plants was exceptional, but according to a lawyer who has been intimate for several years with union-management relations at the plant level in Northeastern United States, the conditions depicted in this paper are common. However, this informant insisted during a conversation on the subject that I have "misinterpreted the meaning" of informal relations. He declared with feeling that behavior of the kind described here is not evasion of the contract but "democracy at work," and that a "semantic approach" would clarify the seeming difficulty.

CULTURAL FACTORS IN THE SELECTION OF MARRIAGE MATES*

AUGUST B. HOLLINGSHEAD
Yale University

THE QUESTION of who marries whom is of perennial interest, but only during the last half-century has it become the subject of scientific research. Throughout American history there has always been a romantic theory of mate selection, supported by poets, dramatists, and the public at large. Social scientists, however—a group of jaundiced realists, by and large—have little faith in this pleasant myth as an explanation for the selection of marriage mates.[1] Their theories can be divided between (1) the homogamous and (2) the heterogamous.[2] The theory of homogamy postulates that "like attracts like"; the theory of heterogamy holds that "opposites attract each other."

Certain aspects of each theory have been investigated by psychologists and sociologists. The psychologists have confined their attention almost exclusively to individual

* Paper read at the annual meeting of the Eastern Sociological Society held in Boston, April 22-23, 1950. Grateful acknowledgment is made hereby to the Social Science Research Council for a grant-in-aid and to the Committee on Bursary Appointments, Yale University for their support of this project.

[1] For a discussion of this theory and some facts to refute it see A. B. Hollingshead, "Class and Kinship in a Middle Western Community," *American Sociological Review,* 14 (August, 1949), 469-475.

[2] E. W. Burgess and Paul Wallin, "Homogamy in Social Characteristics," *American Journal of Sociology,* 49 (September, 1943), 109-124.

This content downloaded from 128.235.251.160 on Tue, 10 Feb 2015 09:44:47 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

physical[3] and psychological[4] characteristics. Sociologists have focused, in the main, upon factors external to the individual. As a consequence, sociological research has stressed such things as ethnic origin,[5] residential propinquity,[6] race,[7] religion,[8] socio-economic status,[9] and social characteristics in general.[10] While all of these researches have used empirical data, only a few of them have attempted to measure the significant cultural factors that impinge upon mate selection against the background of the theories of homogamy and heterogamy. We shall attempt to do this in this paper.

My attack upon this problem will be to state the theoretical limits within which mate selection may take place, then turn to a body of data to determine how, and to what extent, specific factors influence the selection of marital partners.[11]

Viewed in the broadest theoretical perspective of democratic theory, the choice of marriage mates in our society might be conceived of as a process in which each unattached biologically mature adult has an equal opportunity to marry every other unattached biologically mature adult of the opposite sex. Viewed from the narrowest

[3] J. A. Harris, "Assortive Mating in Man," *Popular Science Monthly,* 80 (1912) 476-492. This is the earliest review in the literature that tries to give a scientific explanation of the question of who marries whom. The studies reviewed primarily dealt with physical characteristics: deafness, health, longevity, age, stature, celphalic index, hair and eye color.

[4] Harold E. Jones, "Homogamy in Intellectual Abilities," *American Journal of Sociology,* 35 (1929) 369-382; E. L. Kelly, "Psychological Factors in Assortive Mating," *Psychological Bulletin,* 37 (1940), 493 and 576; Helen M. Richardson, "Studies of Mental Resemblance Between Husbands and Wives and Between Friends," *Psychological Bulletin,* 36 (1939) 104-120.

[5] Bessie B. Wessel, "Comparative Rates of Intermarriage Among Different Nationalities in the United States," *Eugenical News,* 15 (1930), 105-107; Bessie B. Wessel, *An Ethnic Survey of Woonsocket, R.I.,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931; James H. S. Bossard, "Nationality and Nativity as Factors in Marriage," *American Sociological Review,* 4 (December, 1939), 792-798; Ruby Jo Reeves, *Marriages in New Haven since 1870 Statistically Analyzed and Culturally Interpreted,* doctoral dissertation Yale University (unpublished), 1938; Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy, "Single or Triple Melting-Pot? Intermarriage Trends in New Haven, 1870-1940," *American Journal of Sociology,* 39 (January, 1944), 331-339; Milton L. Barron, *Intermarriage in a New England Industrial Community,* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1946. Barron has a good bibliography of studies in this area, pp. 355-366.

[6] James H. S. Bossard, "Residential Propinquity as a Factor in Marriage Selection," *American Journal of Sociology,* 38 (1932), 219-224; Maurice R. Davie and Ruby Jo Reeves, "Propinquity in Residence Before Marriage," *American Journal of Sociology,* 44 (1939), 510-517; Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy, "Pre-Marital Residential Propinquity and Ethnic Endogamy," *American Journal of Sociology,* 48 (March, 1943), 580-584; John S. Ellsworth, Jr., "The Relationship of Population Density to Residential Propinquity as a Factor in Marriage Selection," *American Sociological Review,* 13 (August, 1948), 444-448.

[7] Romanzo Adams, *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii,* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1937; Otto Klineberg, *Characteristics of the American Negro,* New York: Harper & Bros., 1944, especially Part V where Negro-white intermarriage and the restrictions on it imposed by law are discussed; Ulysses G. Weatherly, "Race and Marriage," *American Journal of Sociology,* 15 (1910), 433-453; Robert K. Merton, "Intermarriage and the Social Structure," *Psychiatry,* 4 (August, 1941), 371-374; Constantine Panunzio, "Intermarriage in Los Angeles, 1924-1933," *American Journal of Sociology,* 47 (March, 1942), 399-401.

[8] Reuben R. Resnick, "Some Sociological Aspects of Intermarriage of Jew and Non-Jew," *Social Forces,* 12 (October, 1933), 94-102; J. S. Slotkin, "Jewish-Gentile Intermarriage in Chicago," *American Sociological Review,* 7 (February, 1942), 34-39; Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy, "Single or Triple Melting-Pot?" *op. cit.*

[9] Richard Centers, "Marital Selection and Occupational Strata," *American Journal of Sociology,* 54 (May 1949), 530-535; Donald M. Marvin, "Occupational Propinquity as a Factor in Marriage Selection," *Publications of the American Statistical Association,* 16 (September 1918), 131-156; Meyer F. Nimkoff, "Occupational Factors and Marriage," *American Journal of Sociology,* 49 (November 1943), 248-254.

[10] Walter C. McKain, Jr., and C. Arnold Anderson, "Assortive Mating in Prosperity and Depression," *Sociology and Social Research,* 21 (May-June, 1937), 411-418; E. W. Burgess and Paul Wallin, "Homogamy in Social Characteristics," *American Journal of Sociology,* 49 (September, 1943), 109-124.

[11] For purposes of this paper we shall rely upon tests of significance and measures of association to tell us what cultural factors are of greater or lesser importance in the determination of who marries whom.

This content downloaded from 128.235.251.160 on Tue, 10 Feb 2015 09:44:47 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

perspective of cultural determinism, biologically mature, single males or females have only limited opportunity to select a marital partner. The first proposition assumes complete freedom of individual choice to select a mate; the second assumes that mates are selected for individuals by controls imposed on them by their culture. If the first assumption is valid we should find no association between cultural factors and who marries whom; if the second is descriptive of the mate selection process we should expect to find a strong association between one or several cultural factors and who marries whom. The second proposition, however, allows for individual choice within limits of cultural determinism; for example a Jew is expected to marry a Jew by the rules of his religion; moreover, he is more or less coerced by his culture to marry a Jewess of the same or a similar social status, but he has a choice as to the exact individual.

In the remainder of this paper I shall test five factors—race, age, religion, ethnic origin, and class—within the limits of the theories of homogamy and heterogamy and the abstract model I have outlined. The data utilized to measure the influence of these factors on the selection of marriage mates were assembled in New Haven, Connecticut, by a research team during the last year through the cooperation of the Departments of Vital Statistics of the State of Connecticut and the City of New Haven. All marriage license data on marriages in New Haven during 1948 were copied. Then parents, relatives, in some cases neighbors, were asked in February, 1949, to supply the addresses of each newly married couple. Addresses were obtained for 1,980 couples out of a total of 2,063 couples married in the city in 1948. Nine hundred and three couples, 45.8 per cent, had moved from the city, and 1,077, 54.4 per cent, were living in it in February, 1949. A 50 per cent random sample, drawn by Census Tracts from the 1,077 couples resident in New Haven, was interviewed with a schedule. The interview, which lasted from about an hour and a quarter to three hours, took place in the home of the couple, usually with both the husband and wife present, and occurred most generally in the evening or late afternoon.[12] In addition, twenty-eight census-like items such as age, occupation, birthplace, residence, and marital status, were available on all of the 1,980 couples.

The 523 interviewed couples were compared with the 1,457 non-interviewed couples, census item by census item, to determine if the interviewed group differed significantly from the non-interviewed group. No significance of difference was found at the 5 per cent level for any item, except where the husband and wife were both over 50 years of age.[13] Having satisfied ourselves that the interviewed group was representative of the total group, we proceeded with a measure of confidence to the analysis of our data.

Race. Our data show that the racial mores place the strongest, most explicit, and most precise limits on an individual as to whom he may or may not marry. Although interracial marriages are legal in Connecticut, they are extremely rare; none occurred in New Haven in 1948. Kennedy's analysis of New Haven marriages from 1870 through 1940 substantiates the rule that Negroes and whites marry very infrequently. Thus, we may conclude that a man's or woman's marital choice is effectively limited to his or her own race by the moral values ascribed to race in this culture. Race, thus, divides the community into two parts so far as marriage is concerned. Because there were no interracial marriages in 1948, and because of the small percentage of Negroes in New Haven, we will confine the rest of our discussion to whites.

Age. Age, like race, is a socio-biological factor that has a definite influence on marital

[12] Eighty-seven per cent of the interviewing was done by senior undergraduates and graduate students, 5 per cent by an assistant, and 8 per cent by the writer. Six per cent of the interviews were checked for reliability from one month to four months after the original interview.

[13] The principal reasons for this deviation were (1) twice as many older couples refused to be interviewed as those below fifty years of age, and (2) the age gap between interviewers and potential interviewees influenced the situation.

This content downloaded from 128.235.251.160 on Tue, 10 Feb 2015 09:44:47 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

choice. The effects of cultural usages and values on the selection of a marriage partner may be seen by a study of Table I. While there is a very strong association between the age of the husband and the age of the wife at all age levels, it is strongest when both partners are under 20 years of age. Men above 20 years of age tend to select wives who are in the same 5 year age group as they are, or a younger one. After age 20 the percentage of men who marry women younger than themselves increases until age 50. After 50 the marital partners tend to be nearer one another in age. Table I indicates further that controls relative to age rather effectively limit a man's choice to women of his age or younger, but that the woman cannot be too much younger or counter controls begin to operate. Evidence accumulated in the interviews shows it is widely believed that a young woman should not marry "an old man." The effects of this belief and practice are reflected in the lower left hand section of Table I. There we see that only 4 men above 45 years of age, out of a total of 144, married women under 30 years of age. The age-sanctions that impinge on a woman with reference to the age of a potential husband narrow her marital opportunities to men her age, or to slightly older men. This usage is reflected in the upper right corner of Table I, where marriages between older women and younger men are conspicuous by their absence. In short, differences in the customs relative to age and marital partners place greater restrictions on a woman's marital opportunities than a man's. Nevertheless, it is clear that the values ascribed to age restrict an individual's marital opportunities within narrow limits; and a woman's more than a man's.

Religion. The effects of religious rules on an individual's marital choices were very clear.[14] Next to race, religion is the most dici-

TABLE 1. AGE OF HUSBAND AND WIFE BY FIVE-YEAR INTERVALS FOR NEW HAVEN MARRIAGES, 1948

Age of Husband	Age of Wife								
	15–19	20–24	25–29	30–34	35–39	40–44	45–49	50 & up	Total
15–19	42	10	3						55
20–24	153	504	51	10	1				719
25–29	52	271	184	22	7	2			538
30–34	5	52	87	69	13	5			231
35–39	1	12	27	29	21	2	3		105
40–44		1	9	18	17	8	2	1	56
45–49	1		3	6	16	16	7	1	49
50 & up			1	4	11	15	21	43	95
Total	254	850	365	168	86	47	33	45	1848

$X^2 = 2574.8905$ $P < .01$ $C = .76$ $\overline{C} = .80$

C = The coefficient of contingency.

$\overline{C}$ = The corrected coefficient of contingency corrected for broad grouping by the formula given in Thomas C. McCormick, *Elementary Social Statistics*, McGraw-Hill, 1941, p. 207.

sive factor in the segregation of males and females into categories that are approved or disapproved with respect to nuptiality. Ninety-one per cent of the marriages in this study involved partners from the same religious group. In the case of Jews, this percentage was 97.1, among Catholics it was 93.8 per cent; it fell to 74.4 per cent for Protestants. The differences in percentage, we believe, are a reflection of the relative intensity of in-group sanctions on the indi-

[14] R. J. R. Kennedy, "Single or Triple Melting-Pot? Intermarriage Trends in New Haven, 1870-1940," *op. cit.*

This content downloaded from 128.235.251.160 on Tue, 10 Feb 2015 09:44:47 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

vidual in the three religious groups. A striking point that emerged from our data is that the effects of religion on marital choice has not changed between the parental and present generation.[15] Table II shows that the number of Catholics who married Catholics, and Jews who married Jews, was almost the same in both generations. The number of Protestants who married Protestants dropped in the present generation, but not significantly in terms of the numbers involved.[16] The influence of religious affiliation on the selection of a marriage mate is obviously strongest in the Jewish group and weakest in the Protestant. This is reflected in the number of mixed marriages. On this point, we would remark that there is no consistent bias between sex and mixed Catholic-Protestant marriages; either partner is likely to be a Catholic or a Protestant. On the other hand, in Jewish-Gentile marriages it has been a Jewish male who has married a Gentile female.

I shall point out, in passing, that the very high association we found between religion and marriage is not unique. Burgess and Wallin reported a coefficient of contingency of .75 for the 1,000 engaged couples they studied in Chicago;[17] our data revealed a coefficient of contingency of .77 in the present generation. This is not essentially different from theirs. Because religion is so effective a control in the selection of marriage mates I shall hold it constant and analyze other factors in terms of it.

Ethnic Origin. New Haven remained almost wholly Protestant religiously, and British ethnically, from its settlement in 1638 until the late 1830's. Between 1830 and 1880 Irish arrived by the hundred; Germans and Scandinavians by the score. The Irish and a minority of the Germans were Catholic and they soon established themselves in this burgeoning railroad and manufacturing center. An expanding economy, coupled with political and economic unrest in Southern and Eastern Europe, resulted in the influx of thousands of Polish and Russian Jews, and tens of thousands of

TABLE 2. RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION IN THE PARENTAL AND PRESENT GENERATIONS

A. *Wife's Father and Mother**

Wife's Father	Wife's Mother		
	Catholic	Protestant	Jewish
Catholic	274	11	0
Protestant	9	75	0
Jewish	2	1	65
Total	285	87	65

$X^2 = 522.4592$ $P < .01$ $C = .74$

B. *Husband's Father and Mother*

Husband's Father	Husband's Mother		
	Catholic	Protestant	Jewish
Catholic	273	12	0
Protestant	14	70	0
Jewish	0	0	68
Total	287	82	68

$X^2 = 494.4359$ $P < .01$ $C = .73$

C. Husband and Wife

Husband	Wife		
	Catholic	Protestant	Jewish
Catholic	271	20	0
Protestant	17	61	0
Jewish	1	1	66
Total	289	82	66

$X^2 = 636.0297$ $P < .01$ $C = .77$

* The religious affiliation claimed by the interviewees is used here.

[15] Our discussion on this and subsequent points includes only white marriages where the religion of the couple and of their four parents was known. Moreover, the tabular materials include only white cases where the specific data called for by the table were complete. "Unknown" cases were eliminated in particular instances.

[16] The religious affiliation of marital partners in the present and parental generations was tested for significance; none was found; $X^2 = 6.7015$ with 8 degrees of freedom.

[17] E. W. Burgess and Paul Wallin, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

This content downloaded from 128.235.251.160 on Tue, 10 Feb 2015 09:44:47 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

TABLE 3. INTRAETHNIC AND INTERETHNIC MARRIAGES IN THE PRESENT AND PARENTAL GENERATIONS BY RELIGIOUS GROUPS

A. *Catholic**

Ethnic Derivation	Couple	Parents
Italian	119	302
Polish	11	56
Irish	21	75
Germany & Central Europe		19
British		4
Mixed	120	86
Total	271	542

B. *Protestant*

Ethnic Derivation	Couple	Parents
British	18	61
Northwest Europe	3	20
Polish		2
Mixed	40	39
Total	61	122

C. *Jewish*

Ethnic Derivation	Couple	Parents
Polish & Russian	66	129
German & Polish	0	3
Total	66	132

D. *Mixed Religion*

Ethnic Derivation	Couple	Parents
British	3	26
Northwest Europe	1	13
Italian	0	9
Polish	2	11
Irish	1	8
Mixed	32	11
Total	39	78

* The religious affiliation claimed by the interviewees is used here.

Italians between 1890 and 1914. After 1914, the stream of immigration became a trickle that has never again been allowed to run freely. Thus, today, New Haven is composed mainly of three large religious groups and seven European-derived ethnic stocks: British, Irish, German, Scandinavian, Italian, Polish, and Polish Jewish.[18]

[18] We are excluding Negroes from our discussion.

We cannot discuss how ethnicity is related to the selection of a marriage mate apart from religion, because religion and ethnic origin are so closely related. Observation of Table III will show that ethnicity within a religious group has been a very potent factor in influencing the mate selection process in both the parental and the present generations, but it was stronger a generation ago than it is now. Although ethnic lines are crossed within the Catholic and the Protestant faith more frequently in the present than in the parental generation, this is not true for the Jews. Furthermore, ethnic lines in both generations were crossed, for the most part, within religious groups. This means that the Catholics are becoming a mixture of Irish, Polish, and Italian as a result of intermarriage between these groups, but there is still a large block of unmixed Italian stock in New Haven and smaller blocks of Irish and Polish. The Protestants, on the other hand, select marriage partners mainly from the British segment of the city's population; a minority choose a partner from a Northwestern European group, and in some cases both partners will be of German or Scandinavian descent. Kennedy discovered this process in her study of New Haven marriage records from 1870 to 1940, and developed her theory of the triple melting-pot in terms of it.[19]

Section D of Table III indicates that, in most cases, marriages across religious lines involve the mixing of ethnic stocks. This is true whether Catholics and Protestants marry, or Jews and Gentiles, because the members of each religious group came from such different parts of Europe. From the viewpoint of assimilation, marriages across religious lines are crucial if the triple melting-pot is to become a single melting-pot. But as Kennedy's and our data show, we are going to have three pots boiling merrily side by side with little fusion between them for an indefinite period. Furthermore, if the

[19] For a discussion of this theory see Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy, "Single or Triple Melting-Pot? Intermarriage Trends in New Haven, 1870-1940," *op. cit.*

This content downloaded from 128.235.251.160 on Tue, 10 Feb 2015 09:44:47 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

TABLE 4. RESIDENTIAL CLASS OF HUSBAND AND WIFE FOR RESIDENTS OF NEW HAVEN

Class of Husband	Class of Wife						Total
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	
I	13	7	1	0	3	1	25
II	8	56	8	12	13	8	105
III	1	4	15	5	7	7	39
IV	0	8	4	55	35	38	140
V	0	12	8	30	252	87	389
VI	0	5	9	40	60	196	310
Total	22	92	45	142	370	337	1008

$X^2 = 1045.0605$ $P < .01$ $C = .71$ $\overline{C} = .77$

rules relative to mixed marriages in the Roman Catholic and Jewish churches were followed strictly there would be no mixing of the contents of one pot with those of another. To be sure, ethnic intermixture would occur, but within each respective religious group.

Class. Our discussion of the relationship between social class and marriage will be based on cases where the husband, the wife, and both parental families were *de facto* residents of New Haven.[20] The analysis of 1,008 marriages where the husband, the wife, and their families were residents of New Haven revealed that the class of residential area in which a man's or a woman's family home is located has a very marked influence on his or her marital opportunities. In 587 of these 1,008 marriages, or 58.2 per cent (see Table IV), both partners came from the same class of residential area. When those that involved a partner from an adjacent class area were added to the first group the figure was raised to 82.8 per cent of all marriages.

Careful study of the data presented in Table IV will reveal that the residential class in which a family has its home has a different effect on a woman's marital opportunities in comparison with a man's.

TABLE 5. RESIDENTIAL CLASS OF HUSBAND AND WIFE BY RELIGIOUS GROUPS

A. *Catholic*

Residential Class of Husband	Residential Class of Wife	
	I–III	IV–VI
I–III	16	7
IV–VI	12	161
Total	28	168

$X^2 = 74.8413$ $P < .01$

B. *Protestant*

Residential Class of Husband	Residential Class of Wife	
	I–III	IV–VI
I–III	12	4
IV–VI	1	18
Total	13	22

$X^2 = 18.0923$ $P < .01$

C. *Jewish*

Residential Class of Husband	Residential Class of Wife	
	I–III	IV–VI
I–III	24	2
IV–VI	3	15
Total	27	17

$X^2 = 26.6687$ $P < .01$

[20] The index of class position used here was developed by Maurice R. Davie on the basis of the ecological analysis he had made of the city of New Haven. Davie has ranked the 22 natural ecological areas that are primarily residential into six classes. Class I is the best and Class VI the worst type of residential area. For a discussion of the project on which these ratings are made, see Maurice R. Davie, "The Patterns of Urban Growth," *Studies in the Science of Society*, G. P. Murdock, ed., New Haven, 1937, pp. 133-161.

This content downloaded from 128.235.251.160 on Tue, 10 Feb 2015 09:44:47 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

While the modal, as well as the majority, of marriages at all levels united class equals, when class lines were crossed the man selected a woman from a lower class far more frequently than was true for women. For instance, if you look at Table IV you will see that 12 men from class I married women from lower ranking areas, and four of the twelve married girls from class V and class VI areas. On the other hand, 9 women from class I areas married men from lower ranking areas, but 8 of the 9 came from a class II area and 1 from a class III area. No man from class IV, V, or VI areas married a woman from a class I area. If you follow down the successive class levels on Table IV you will see that this tendency is repeated all the way to class VI. It is clearest, however, in classes IV and V. In class IV, only 12 women from classes II and III combined married men from class IV. On the other hand, class IV men married 35 class V and 38 class VI women, for a total of 73. Fifty class V men married women from classes II, III, and IV, but 87 married class VI women. These figures reveal that the man has a wider range of choice than a woman, but he tends, when he goes outside of his own class, to marry a woman in a lower class. From whatever way we view Table IV, it is evident that the class position of a family is a factor that exerts a very important influence on the marriage choice of its children.

TABLE 6. YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED BY HUSBAND AND WIFE BY RELIGION

A. *Catholic*

Years of School Husband	Years of School Wife		
	9 & less	10–12	13 & more
9 & less	35	19	1
10–12	33	128	27
13 & more	5	15	19
Total	73	162	47

$X^2 = 80.9784$ $P < .01$

B. *Protestant*

Years of School Husband	Years of School Wife		
	9 & less	10–12	13 & more
9 & less	11	3	0
10–12	10	26	7
13 & more	3	6	16
Total	24	35	23

$X^2 = 38.9932$ $P < .01$

C. *Jewish*

Years of School Husband	Years of School Wife		
	9 & less	10–12	13 & more
9 & less	0	0	0*
10–12	0	22	11
13 & more	0	8	26
Total	0	30	37

$X^2 = 12.6033$ $P < .01$

* The zero cells were not included in the X^2.

Now that we have seen the larger picture, we will look at it from the special perspective of a combination of religion and residential class. Because the number of cases where we knew both religion and class level was small in some residential areas, we have combined classes I through III, and classes IV through VI in Table V. Table V indicates very clearly that the class factor operates independently of religion, and with about equal force in each religious group. What is especially significant is that the effects of class position on who marries whom are so strong in each religious group.

Education operates in the same way as residence to sort potential marriage mates into horizontal status groups within the confines of religion. Within each religious group men with a particular amount of education married women with a comparable amount of education in very significant numbers. This tendency was strongest in the Jewish and weakest in the Catholic group. The strong association between the educational level of the husband and the wife, so evident in Table VI, is not a new development. We compared the education of husbands and wives in the parental generation by religious groups and found that for both

This content downloaded from 128.235.251.160 on Tue, 10 Feb 2015 09:44:47 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

the husband's parents and the wife's parents the association held. Moreover, the coefficients of contingency for each set of parents by religion were almost the same, as the following tabulation shows:

Religion	*Husband's Parents'*	*Wife's Parents'*
Catholic	.57	.58
Protestant	.58	.59
Jewish	.59	.59

These coefficients indicate that education, along with religion, has influenced the mate selection process for at least two generations.

In summary, this paper has attempted to throw light on three questions: *first,* does a biologically mature unattached adult have an equal opportunity to marry an unattached mature adult of the opposite sex? *Second,* what restrictions are placed on his choice by society, and *third,* how effective are certain selected restrictions in limiting his choice? These questions become meaningful only when we relate them to the two propositions outlined in the introduction. There I set up a model with theoretical limits of absolute freedom of individual choice in the selection of a marital partner at one pole, and no choice at the other.

The data presented demonstrate that American culture, as it is reflected in the behavior of newly married couples in New Haven, places very definite restrictions on whom an individual may or may not marry. The racial mores were found to be the most explicit on this point. They divided the community into two pools of marriage mates and an individual fished for a mate only in his own racial pool. Religion divided the white race into three smaller pools. Persons in the Jewish pool in 97.1 per cent of the cases married within their own group; the percentage was 93.8 for Catholics and 74.4 for Protestants. Age further subdivided the potential pool of marriage mates into rather definite age grades, but the limits here were not so precise in the case of a man as of a woman. The ethnic origin of a person's family placed further restrictions on his marital choice. In addition, class position and education stratified the three religious pools into areas where an individual was most likely to find a mate. When all of these factors are combined they place narrow limits on an individual's choice of a marital partner. At the moment we cannot go beyond this point and assign a proportionate probable weight to each one.

In conclusion, I think the data we have presented strongly support the proposition that one's subculture, and one's race, age, and class positions in the society effectively determine the kind of a person one will marry, but not the exact individual. In a highly significant number of cases the person one marries is very similar culturally to one's self. Our data clearly support the theory of homogamy, rather than that of heterogamy, *but* a generalized theory of the precise influence of cultural and individual factors on the selection of marriage mates remains to be formulated. This is an objective for sociologists to work toward.

This content downloaded from 128.235.251.160 on Tue, 10 Feb 2015 09:44:47 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions